

 said second domain having input means for inputting, to the database, information relating to a part delivered in accordance with an order.

### **REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

#### **Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-36 are pending. By this amendment, claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 11-14, 16, 21, 22 and 24 have been amended for the purpose of clarity. Claims 18 and 26 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments.

#### **Information Disclosure Statement**

Applicants enclose herewith English Abstracts for each of the Japanese references submitted on June 21, 1999 along with an Information Disclosure Statement, but not considered by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request consideration of the previously submitted Japanese references along with the submitted English Abstracts.

#### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶1**

Claims 1-17, 21-25 and 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶1 as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Specifically, regarding claims 1, 9, 11-13, 16, 21-25 and 29, the Examiner has indicated that the expanding means, means for expansion and the step of

expanding are not enabled by the specification. Regarding claim 8, the Examiner believes that the "nodeless tree structure" is not enabled by the specification.

Regarding the rejection as to claims 1, 9, 11-13, 16, 21-25 and 29, the expanding means, means for performing expansion and the step of expanding of the claims are discussed and supported in the specification as the constructional expansion process and system. This process and system are discussed throughout the specification, such as on page 33, line 17-page 34, line 4. For the purposes of clarification, the claim language of the expanding means and the step of expanding have been amended to read "expansion means" and "the step of performing expansion", respectively.

Regarding the nodeless tree structure, claim 8 has been amended to delete the language of "nodeless". Claim 8 is believed to be supported by the specification.

For the above reasons, claims 1-17, 21-25 and 29 are believed to be supported by Applicants' disclosure. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims are respectfully requested.

#### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2**

The Examiner also has objected to the specification as containing informalities and the claims as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2. The claims and the specification have been amended to address the concerns of the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection of the specification and the rejection of the claims are respectfully requested.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103**

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-8, 16-19, 21, 26 and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,992,940 to Dworkin. Claims 9, 10 and 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,204,821 to Inui et al. Claims 3, 11-17 and 22-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Dworkin. Claims 20, 28 and 30-36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Inui. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the claims as well as the Examiner's Official Notices.

Independent claims 1 and 21 are directed to a parts ordering system having a first domain, a second domain and a third domain connected in a tree structure in which each domain is a unit of processing in a computer system corresponding to a working unit on a production line. An order received from one domain is expanded into its component parts and an order for each of the expanded component parts is communicated to another domain.

On the contrary, Dworkin shows a system that enables a user to search a product database for a product or product type and vendor/supplier through a categorical menu or search terms. Dworkin simply does not disclose or suggest expanding an order into its component parts or communicating to another domain an order for each of the expanded component parts.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the structure of the domains and processing performed therein, as claimed, are not disclosed or suggest in Dworkin, e.g., each domain is a unit of processing in a computer system corresponding to a working unit on a production line.

Accordingly, claim 1 and 12 and the claims dependent therefrom are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Independent claims 11, 12, 22 and 23 are directed to an arrangement in which (1) a received order is expanded into its component parts and an order for each of the expanded component parts is communicated to another domain and (2) communication of an order to another domain is stopped in a case where an amount of specific parts contained in inventory is greater than a required amount of specific parts. Each domain is a unit of processing in a computer system corresponding to a working unit on a production line.

As discussed above for claims 1 and 21, Dworkin does not disclose or suggest expanding an order into its component parts or communicating to another domain an order for each of the expanded component parts, or the structure and processing of the domains in which each domain is a unit of processing in a computer system corresponding to a working unit on a production line.

Furthermore, as acknowledged by the Examiner, Dworkin does not disclose or suggest the stopping of communication as noted above, but the Examiner believes and has taken Official Notice that “it would have been logical to stop the order, in case the number of parts available in the inventory is more than the parts required to make/assemble a product.” Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner’s Official Notice. The Examiner has not provided any support in the prior art for modifying Dworkin in the suggested manner. Clearly, the Examiner is employing impermissible hindsight based on the Applicants’ disclosure.

Independent claims 13 and 16 are directed to are directed to a parts ordering

system having a first domain, a second domain and a third domain connected in a tree structure in which each domain is a unit of processing in a computer system corresponding to a working unit on a production line. As claimed, a received order from a first domain is expanded into its component parts and (2) permission to access ordering information is controlled through control means.

As discussed above for claims 1 and 21, Dworkin does not disclose or suggest expanding an order into its component parts, or the structure and processing of the domains in which each domain is a unit of processing in a computer system corresponding to a working unit on a production line.

Furthermore, as acknowledged by the Examiner, Dworkin does not disclose or suggest control of permission to access ordering information, but the Examiner believes and has taken Official Notice that “it would have been logical to have means for knowing order(s) received relative to a part by the vendor(s) and the fulfillment of the order/issuance of the ordered part.” Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner’s Official Notice. The Examiner has not provided any support in the prior art for modifying Dworkin in the suggested manner. Clearly, the Examiner is employing impermissible hindsight based on the Applicants’ disclosure.

Independent claim 24 is directed to an arrangement in which (1) a received order is expanded into its component parts and an order for each of the expanded component parts is communicated to another domain and (2) information relating to a part delivery in accordance with an order is inputted in a database.

As discussed above for claims 1 and 21, Dworkin does not disclose or suggest expanding and order into its component parts or communicating to another domain an order for

each of the expanded component parts, or the structure and processing of the domains in which each domain is a unit of processing in a computer system corresponding to a working unit on a production line.

Furthermore, Dworkin, as relied upon by the Examiner, does not disclose or suggest input of information relating to a part delivery. The portions of Dworkin relied upon by the Examiner simply show communication between a CPU 1 and a terminal 5. See e.g., Fig. 1 (1,5), Col. 4, lines 3-4, Office Action page 20.

Independent claims 9 and 29 are directed to a parts ordering system and a program, respectively, in which a machining plan is devised based on a received order, expansion is performed into each component part according to the machining plan, an order plan is devised for each expanded component part and order is placed according to the order plan. These above processes are performed in a domain, and not in different domains.

On the contrary, Inui shows an order issue management system that is different than the above claimed arrangement. The order issue management system of Inui scans a parts master file to extract required data relating to parts to be ordered based on information fed to the system from a production schedule system, a parts information system and a car information system. Thereafter, the order issue managing system issues orders accordingly to a received order managing system. Inui simply does not disclose or suggest the claimed combination of claims 9 and 29 or the general structure or processing of the domains as claimed.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's reading of the reference Inui on claims 9 and 29. For example, in regard to claim 9, the Examiner indicates that the domain on a first network is met by factory 10 of Inui and the domain of the second

network is met by factory 20 and communication network 30. However, the Examiner then asserts that some of the claimed elements of the domain in the second network are met by components of factory 10 (e.g., reference numerals 11-14 of Fig. 1) in Inui which was initially asserted as teaching the domain in the first network. See Office Action, page 9. The Examiner has improperly taken inconsistent positions in relying on Inui. Furthermore, the Examiner's assertions, as applied to the claims, are inconsistent with the operational flow of the Inui system as shown in Fig. 1. Clearly, the Examiner is employing impermissible hindsight based on the Applicants' disclosure.

Independent claims 20 and 28 are directed to a parts ordering system and method in which information is communicated between a first and second network selectively depending on the importance of secrecy of the information. Communication of information is performed based on the importance of secrecy of the information. As acknowledged by the Examiner, Inui does not disclose or suggest the above-noted arrangement, but the Examiner believes and has taken Official Notice that generally secrecy in information transfer is old and well known. Applicants respectfully disagree with and traverse the Examiner's Official Notice.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's Official Notice still does not address, teach or disclose communication of information being performed based on the importance of secrecy of the information in the context of a parts ordering system or method. The Examiner has not provided any support in the prior art for modifying Inui in the suggested manner. Clearly, the Examiner is employing impermissible hindsight based on the Applicants' disclosure.

Independent claims 30, 33 and 34 are directed to a parts ordering system and method involving display of an icon for identifying receipt of an order or issuance of an order and data indicating results of receipt of an order or issuance of an order represented by the icon. Again, the Examiner has acknowledged that Inui does not disclose or suggest the above claimed display of the icon and data, but believes and has taken Official Notice that icons and their respective narrative representation(s) is old and well known technique in the computer art. Applicants respectfully disagree with and traverse the Examiner's Official Notice:

Furthermore, the Examiner's Official Notice still does not address the deficiency in the Inui teaching, namely display of information identifying receipt of an order or issuance of an order and data indicating results of receipt of an order or issuance of an order. The Examiner has not provided any support in the prior art for modifying Inui in the suggested manner. Clearly, the Examiner is employing impermissible hindsight based on the Applicants' disclosure.

### **CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of this application.

### **AUTHORIZATION**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account 13-4500, Order No. 1232-4555. A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to



grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 1232-4555. A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN

Dated: November 7, 2000

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
James Hwa  
Registration No. 42,680  
(202) 857-7887

Mailing Address:  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN  
345 Park Avenue  
New York, New York 10154  
(212) 758-4800